

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended.

Claims 9-16 have been cancelled.

Claims 17-24 have been added.

The following remarks are based, in part, on a discussion with the Examiner on January 3, 2006. Claims 1-8 are now believed to overcome the Examiner's rejections.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §112

In the September 9, 2006 Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §101 because the Examiner alleged the steps of *retrieving* and *storing* were "merely descriptive material without reaching a final result as being useful, concrete and tangible." The Applicant contends that combining the steps of *retrieving* and *storing* in claim 1 satisfies 35 USC §101. However, the step of *copying* was added in response to the September 9, 2006 Office Action to accelerate the prosecution.

In the October 27, 2006 Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, because the Examiner alleged that claim 1 was "indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention." The Examiner further stated that, "It is not made clear that any displaying is being performed."

The Examiner may have assumed that the Applicant regarded the step of *copying* to include *displaying*. However, it was not the intention of the Applicant to include the step of *displaying*. Furthermore, paragraphs [0019] through [0023] of the Application clearly illustrate usefulness by way of the efficiency improvements that may be achieved with the method of *retrieving, storing, and copying* as described in claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 satisfies 35 USC §101.

The phrase "for display" has been removed from the step of *copying*. The third step now states, "copying the pixel image data at least in part by accessing the plurality of colorspace components from the machine-readable memory." Therefore, claim 1 satisfies 35 USC §112.

Claim Rejections 35 USC §103

Claim 1 has been amended to claim “each colorspace component is one of three different types” and “one type of colorspace component is stored in each burst.” The cited art, individually or in combination, does not teach that each colorspace component is one of three different types and one type of colorspace component is stored in each burst. In view of at least the foregoing, claim 1 overcomes the Examiner’s **35 USC §103** rejection.

With these amendments, claim 1 is in condition for allowance. Claims 2-8 are dependent on claim 1. In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims 1-8 are in condition for allowance.

New Claims

Paragraph [0024] of the Application states, “The methods described above may be implemented using one or more data processing devices.” Claim 17 is a processing device, which performs the steps of **retrieving**, **storing**, and **copying** substantially as described in claim 1. Since claim 1 is in condition for allowance, claim 17 is also in condition for allowance. Furthermore, claims 18-24 claim the dependencies substantially as described in claims 2-8. In view of at least the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims 17-24 are in condition for allowance.


A Notice of Allowability is courteously solicited for claims 1-8 and 17-24. Should the Examiner disagree or have any questions regarding this submission, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner telephone the undersigned at (312) 775-8000. The Commissioner is

Application No. 10/729,275
Response dated January 5, 2007
Reply to Office action of October 27, 2006

hereby authorized to charge additional fee(s) or credit overpayment(s) to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 5, 2007



Wayne H. Bradley
Reg. No. 39,916

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.
500 W. Madison Street - Suite 3400
Chicago, Illinois 60661
(312) 775-8187